

## **REMARKS**

In the Reply filed on September 24, 2009, the undersigned had **incorrectly** noted in the Remarks section that Applicants proposed canceling claim 6. In fact, and as correctly noted in the listing of claims, Applicants wish to **amend** claim 6. The undersigned submits this Supplemental Reply to clarify this typographical error in the Remarks section of the previously submitted reply. Other than correcting this noted informality in the Remarks section, this paper is the substantively the same as that submitted September 24<sup>th</sup>.

Please note that a one month extension of time for responding to the pending office action was previously submitted with the September 24<sup>th</sup> reply. This reply is being submitted prior to the second month of extension period. The undersigned understands that no further extension is necessary.

Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 8, 9, and 27-48 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-7, 11-26, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants proposes amending claims 1-7 and 49.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### ***Interview Summary***

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Felten for granting the telephonic interview of August 13, 2009. During that interview, the undersigned and Examiner Felten discussed the language of claim 1 and the pending objections. Examiner Felten agreed to give further consideration to the proposed amendments upon submission of a written reply.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Office has indicated that claims 1-7 and 10-26 and 49 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph***

Claims 1-7, 11-26, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the claimed subject matter. In

**DOCKET NO.:** POPT-0004  
**Application No.:** 09/676,374  
**Office Action Dated:** May 27, 2009

**PATENT**

particular, the Office appears to have taken issue with the language used in the last clause of claim 1. Applicants propose amending the clause to read as follows: “determining at the computer system results from searching, the results comprising a list of option spreads having values for the set of searchable parameters that match the user defined search criteria.” Applicants respectfully submit that the clause is clear and unambiguous when read in the context of the remainder of the claim and in view of the specification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

The undersigned respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable and the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Examiner Felten is invited to call the undersigned in the event a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Date: September 28, 2009

/John E. McGlynn/  
John E. McGlynn  
Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439